

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re App. No.:	09/449,021	)	<u>PATENT APPLICATION</u>
		)	
Filing Date:	November 24, 1999	)	Art Unit: 2192
		)	
Inventor:	Emmelmann	)	Examiner: C. Kendall
		)	
Title:	<i>Interactive Server Side</i>	)	
	<i>Components</i>	)	
<hr/>			<u>Customer No.: 28554</u>

**SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a summary of the telephonic interview between applicant and Supervisory Examiner Tuan Dam on November 10, 2009.

## SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

1. Applicant Helmut Emmelmann and his attorney Richard Nebb called Supervisory Examiner Tuan Dam specifically because of a statement that was made in the most recent office action that reads like a citation, but in fact is not. This statement was repeated by Mr. Dam in a telephone interview with attorney Nebb on September 20, 2009 as support for the current rejections, and it appears to applicant that Mr. Dam was erroneously considering this statement as an explicit citation from the WebWriter article. The statement is:

*“WebWriter is said to be an editor that runs in a Web browser, which seamlessly generates / creates web pages while the application is run”*

(See p. 24 of 7/1/09 OA, and compare with page 4 of the Web Writer article section “Creating the Template pages”).

As written by the Examiner, the statement appears to be taken directly from the WebWriter article to support the Examiner’s rejection. However, the WebWriter article only refers to an editor that runs in a Web browser, and says nothing about “generating web pages while the application is run,” as the statement suggests. In fact, the word “application” does not appear at all in the cited section of the article. Applicant submits that WebWriter runs the application being edited only after editing is complete. For example, the article says: *“Once a WebWriter application is created and saved to disk it can be **run**”* (see p. 6, col. 2 of WebWriter I, in the section entitled “Running the Application” (emphasis added)).

Mr. Dam did not immediately have access to the article so he could not immediately verify our assertion, but promised to do so offline.

Since this application was withdrawn from issue after consideration by the quality review group, Applicant believes that the quality review group assumed from the naming conventions used in the article that the WebWriter page generator is part of the WebWriter editor, but this is not true, as detailed in applicant’s recent response and also applicant’s letter to the Examiner and his Supervisor dated September 23, 2009; and therefore arguments stating that the WebWriter page generator executes the application are irrelevant when considering the WebWriter editor.

2. Applicant then explained the advantages of running the application while editing: computed content is shown WYSIWYG, i.e., during editing it looks similar to the ultimate end product with the addition of editing features. Applicant referred Mr. Dam to Figure 7b of WebWriter, which shows how a page template being edited with the WebWriter editor actually looks during editing. This figure shows that WebWriter does not show content WYSIWYG, specifically with respect to the dynamically generated parts of a page, but instead, just shows placeholders for the dynamic content. Fig. 6b of the article shows what the page looks like when the application is run. In contrast, Figs. 1 and 2 of applicant's specification show the same comparative figures for applicant's editor, with both figures showing functional pages with functional buttons. In addition, Fig. 2 shows handles that permit editing of the page.

3. Claim language was then discussed, and Mr. Dam noted that the dynamic editing limitation has been removed from some claims by applicant's recent amendments. Applicant notes, however, that this limitation is still present in claims 59, 90 and 125. Applicant believes that this limitation is not required in any of the claims and that other limitations are sufficient.

4. In claim 1, the term "the generated document" is defined in the preamble as a document generated by one of the applications being edited and the claim requires "a document generator program running at least part of one of the applications being edited and generating the generated documents." Therefore, it is clear in the claim that the generated document results from running at least part of the edited application.

Other limitations in the claim make sure that "said generated documents" include editing features, and that the editor operates on the generated documents displayed by the browser via the editing features.

In contrast, the WebWriter page generator runs the application after editing, but the resulting pages do not contain editing features and are not used by the editor.

5. Claim 6 was also briefly discussed. It introduces instructions for generating a generated page from a page template for display on the client computer, which describes the normal operation of web applications using page templates.

Then, claim 6 requires an editor for editing components on the page template, wherein the editor displays a page for editing. The main limitation then requires that a component has a similar appearance on the page being edited as on the generated page (with the addition of editing features). This requires some kind of WYSIWYG editing by requiring that components have a similar appearance on the page seen during editing and on the generated page seen during normal operation. Fig. 6b and Fig. 7b of the WebWriter article clearly show that this is not the case in the WebWriter editor.

6. Applicant also noted that claim 74 recites a totally different distinctive feature, a dynamic component set, which has not been addressed at all by recent office actions.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 16, 2009 By: /Richard A. Nebb/  
Richard A. Nebb  
Reg. No. 33,540

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DeNIRO LLP  
575 Market Street, Suite 2500  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: 415.369.9660  
Facsimile: 415.369.9665